

CM Boryslawskyj, MBA  
Spiral Shell Web LLC  
39 Clark Hill Rd  
East Hampton, CT 06424

July 15, 2010

Commission's Secretary, Office of the Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> St., SW Room TW-A325  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**RE: Notice of Inquiry (NOI)  
Structure and Practices of the Video Relay Services  
CG Docket No. 10-51**

Before I will make some comments, I would like to express my appreciation for your offering the deaf and hard of hearing community the opportunity to respond to the Notice of Inquiry as of June 28, 2010.

As you asked us to take a fresh look at the Video Relay Service rules I understand that this service should be efficient, effective and sustainable. I have some concerns about the definition of "sustainable" – should it be measured in any way to limit the quality of our life as minimal as if it should be manageable accordingly for "basic rights" in spite of our hope for full equal access as you call it as functionally equivalent (FE)?

In improving the program by full spectrum of users as I believe you encourage innovation, I would like to make a valid point to urge you for reconsideration about adding service available to deaf users as follows:

For example:

**Deaf user to Deaf user through VRS**

VRS should be able to offer this feature and so TTY users may be service provider, professional or deaf user who prefers using TTY instead of VP. => **TTY to VP or Captel to VP**

In similar to texting Deaf user being stranded on highway or in some places where there is lack of videophone equipment like airport, train station or mall, VRS should be able to offer this option to VP users. => **Pager to VP**

Commission's Secretary, Office of the Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission

July 16, 2010

Page 2

That is a major barrier that VRS does not offer the service from deaf VP to deaf VP although VP is not always there but they use texting, TTY or webcam. Will it be functionally equivalent?

Regarding the Interstate TRS Fund, I understand that typically we use TTY through Phone Company we would have to pay phone calls for local and long distance. In case of using VP, I have to pay monthly fee for high speed Internet through cable (in which it is Comcast in my rural area as only one provider available and the price is costly.) I express my serious concern about the stability and reliability of high speed connection in spite of stuck with one modem remaining on one room rather than the entire house with two story floors.

For example,

I would like to add three VPs in some rooms in first and second floors but Comcast wanted to charge "one liner" per month such as \$65. Supposed I add three VPs with three liners and so the Comcast wants to multiply \$65 by 3 equipments, not including wireless router. (This would equal to \$195 per month).

However, I had to do wireless router to connect to one modem but the reception may decrease if I would like to use VP upstairs. Therefore, I was forced to bring VP equipment and router near the modem and so the reception works well as same as uploading speed remains steady. Ridiculously I have three VP equipments set up in a single room just because of bandwidth limitation and high speed cost issue.

For outreach program I would like to comment that the nonprofit organizations should be encouraged to apply for funding to offer the new outreach and marketing program in each state because intimidation is one reason. As I had the experience to meet with deaf consumers, thanks to my spare time to work as volunteer for Communication Advocacy Network in CT, I am willing to share true stories. Some deaf consumers are afraid of harassment by several VRS providers if they do not follow their rules they would lose entitlement to use the VP equipment or VRS. Sometimes some deaf consumers cannot afford to wait for VRS technical person as normally the average waiting time is two weeks. If VP equipment has not functioned properly then the replacement will arrive in more than one month. I think the nonprofit organization is an appropriate place for deaf consumer to come in and borrow any VP device for temporary in case that the equipment does not work for time being.

Of course there is a major concern about interoperability among VP equipments as though Sorenson VP 200 equipment is obsolete and does not meet our expectation adequately. I support some people including Purple Communication about adding functionality such as "call forwarding" as I believe call forwarding should be enabled on all VP equipments. Same with hearing callers they have caller id and call block on their

Commission's Secretary, Office of the Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission

July 16, 2010  
Page 3

cell phones and almost all their equipments. I would like to see both caller id and call block feature on VP equipments as well.

For example, Communication Assistant (CA) did not spell out the phone number very clear as most of CAs used numbers by signing via fingers which it makes more difficult for some deaf users like myself to read their fingers. I would prefer them to type numbers in text or indicate the caller's number. In most cases I notice the caller's number on the VP but the CA finger-spelled so quickly to show different number than the number showing up on the device. So often I had to use "callback" because of inability to read the CA's signing the phone number. Will the 'callback' be allowed?

For call blockage, some CAs continued to call me regardless of my useless pleas not to let other callers use my VP through VRS such as telemarketing calls, sales calls, or harassment calls. For deaf VP to deaf VP I had received harassment calls through VP all night, sometimes 7 days, or other late nights. I put several requests to Sorenson VRS to block certain deaf people's ten digit phone numbers but they refused to help me out except suggesting me to pull off the VP connection. Do you think it is wise to turn off VP during time of emergency? Same with the rest of my family some deaf VP users continue to harass my parents during very late night hours like 11 PM to 2 AM, my sister almost every day and my brother too. How would it be resolved? It is very simple to block the VP number whenever we want for any reason but in this case there is no functionality to enable this call blockage.

It is important to allow hearing people to use ten digit phone numbers with one condition that they are able to use ASL (sign language). My parents and one of my three siblings including nephew and nieces are unable to communicate with us as there are three deaf VP relatives. Prior to the age of VP usage each of family member was required to have TTY to contact us anytime but until now they are unable to except email. They refuse to use VRS not because they are hearing but they prefer to communicate directly to us as they know us very well and use ASL. Secondly hearing professionals including counselor, administrator, or colleague who work in the deaf community every day are unable to communicate with deaf VP users because of FCC regulation. So they have to contact us by email or (God forbids), some of them I knew have to pretend that they are deaf. Do you want to encourage this abuse? If you recognize functionally equivalent must apply to everyone using ASL, I bet that the fraud and abuse will dramatically be reduced.

Commission's Secretary, Office of the Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission

July 16, 2010  
Page 4

For near future, I hope for your reconsideration to promote innovation as well as research & development through the awards; the sponsorships and prizes would greatly improve the better video communication technology - mobile with residence VP, webcam with VP device, TV screen with VP calls (at this present hearing VoIP users are able to access to TV through cable and satellite providers), so forth. This will bring up to the appropriate standard level of functionally equivalent as well as the VRS service should be efficient, effective and sustainable.

Sincerely,

/s/  
CM Boryslawskyj, MBA